

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	SACV 11-0485 AG (AJWx)	Date	July 12, 2013
Title	LISA LIBERI, et al. v. ORLY TAITZ, et al.		

Present: The Honorable	ANDREW J. GUILFORD
-------------------------------	--------------------

Lisa Bredahl	Not Present	
Deputy Clerk	Court Reporter / Recorder	Tape No.
Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:	Attorneys Present for Defendants:	

Proceedings: [IN CHAMBERS] ORDER DENYING PENDING REQUESTS

The Court previously ordered all parties to seek leave of Court before filing any motions or other documents in this case. (June 14, 2011 Order, Dkt. No. 227.) On July 6, 2013, Orly Taitz, as “counsel for defendants,” emailed the Court requesting that the Court “hold an urgent hearing to obtain addresses of all the plaintiffs . . . in order to serve each of them with pleadings . . . for the purpose of filing a notice of appeal of the denial of antiSLAPP.” This request sparked a flurry of emails to the Court including, among other things, an opposition, a reply, a joinder, and, as is typical in this matter, requests for sanctions. The opposition clearly establishes that the initial request is improper. (*See also* Dkt. Nos. 633, 634.) The subsequent requests are also improper. The requests are DENIED.

Further, the requests further evidence why it was necessary to monitor filings in order to “secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of [this] action.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

Taitz also states that “[a]ll Taitz defendants decided to file an appeal of antiSLAPP and stay proceedings in the District Court pending decision in AntiSLAPP.” Accordingly, everything is stayed for Defendants Orly Taitz, Defend Our Freedoms Foundations, Inc.,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No.	SACV 11-0485 AG (AJWx)	Date	July 12, 2013
Title	LISA LIBERI, et al. v. ORLY TAITZ, et al.		

Orly Taitz, Inc., and Law Offices of Orly Taitz. Any remaining defendants may continue to be active in this case.

Finally, the Court notes that the parties' actions continue to highlight the Ninth Circuit's concern, shared by this Court, that "the parties in this case have persisted in treating the courts as a public spectacle in which they repeatedly manifest their personal dislike for one another without regard to the truth or appropriate decorum." (Mandate, Dkt. No. 609, at 5, n.1.) The parties' unwillingness to heed the Court's admonition to "focus on substantive matters and to stop all the bickering" continues to frustrate the pursuit of justice. (June 26, 2013 Order, Dkt. No. 640, at 2.)

Initials of
Preparer

_____ : _____
lmb